



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,674	03/25/2004	George John Dawkins	AUS920040128US1	7811

35525 7590 12/28/2007
IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/28/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,674

Applicant(s)

DAWKINS ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on October 11, 2007. Claims 1-22 and 24-28 are pending. Claim 23 is canceled and claim 28 is newly added by the applicant. At this time, claims 1-22 and 24-28 are still rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed October 11, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-27 under 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sayle (US 6,356,863 B1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-22 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (US 5,586,260), in view of Waite et al (US 5,103,476), and further in view of Sayle (US 6,356,863 B1).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Hu teaches a method in a multi-partitioned data processing system for managing operating systems (as shown in Figure 1 and column 1, lines 9-19 of Hu), the method comprising:

(1) receiving a request from an operating system in the multi-partitioned data processing system to register for access to hardware in the multi-partitioned data processing system, wherein the request includes a key code for the operating system (**column 1, lines 17-26; lines 57-67 of Hu**);

(2) responsive to receiving the request, determining whether the operating system is an authorized operating system using the key code; and registering the operating system if the operating system is the authorized operating system (**column 1, lines 17-26; column 2, lines 30-41; and column 4, lines 17-43 of Hu**).

ii. Although Hu teaches a method in a multi-partitioned data processing system for managing operating systems (as shown in Figure 1 and column 1, lines 9-19 of Hu), Hu is silent on the capability of registering the operating system and/or computer. On the other hand, Waite teaches this limitation in **Figures 1 and 3 and column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 42 of Waite**.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hu with the teaching of Waite for monitoring the licensees is warranted (**column 1, lines 30-31 of Waite**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Hu with the teaching of Waite to ensure that all copies of the activated program will include unique licensee identification data, thereby allowing unauthorized copies to be traced to the original licensee (**column 2, lines 10-13 of Waite**).

v. Eventhough the combination of teaching between Hu and Waite teaches the limitation of received the request in column 3, lines 29-32 of Waite, they are not very clear of showing received the request from the operating system, if indeed it is not inherently. On the other hand, Sayle teaches this limitation in **column 9, lines 32-35 of Sayle**.

vi. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the modified-invention of Hu with the teaching of Sayle for providing file systems that are further capable of receiving and

replying to file system requests involving data stored in remote machines through conventional protocol means (**column 1, lines 17-20 of Sayle**).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Hu further teaches:

(1) terminating the operating system if the operating system is an-unauthorized operating system (**column 1, lines 39-40 of Hu**).

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Hu further teaches:

(1) wherein the determining step includes: comparing the key code to a set of key codes for authorized operating systems; and determining whether a match is present between the key code and any key code in the set of key codes (**column 2, lines 20-25; lines 45-50 of Hu**).

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. Hu further teaches:

(1) wherein the set of key codes is located in a partition profile (**see Figure 4, element 56; column 2, line 9; column 6, lines 9-11 of Hu**).

e. Referring to claim 5:

i. Hu further teaches:

(1) wherein the set of key codes are defined through a hardware management console (**column 4, lines 38-43 of Hu**).

f. Referring to claim 6:

i. Hu further teaches:

(1) wherein the partition profile is stored in a nonvolatile memory (**column 4, lines 38-43 of Hu**).

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. Hu further teaches:

(1) wherein the key code for the operating system is embedded within the operating system and is a unique key code (**see Figure 4, element 56; column 2, line 9; column 6, lines 9-11 of Hu**).

h. Referring to claim 8:

i. Hu further teaches:

(1) wherein the receiving step, the determining step, and the registering step are performed in platform firmware **(as shown in Figure 1 and column 1, lines 9-19 of Hu)**.

i. Referring to claim 9:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claims 1-2, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-2 above.

j. Referring to claim 10:

i. This claim consists a data processing system for managing operating systems to implement claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

k. Referring to claims 11-18:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 2-9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 2-9 above.

l. Referring to claim 19:

i. This claim consists a computer program product in a computer readable medium for managing operating systems to implement claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

m. Referring to claims 21-22, 24-27:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 2-9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 2-9 above.

n. Referring to claim 28:

i. The combination of teaching between Hu, Waite, and Sayle teaches the claimed subject matter. Waite further teaches:

(1) wherein the multi-partitioned data processing system is a single computing device (see Figure 3, element 10 and column 6, lines 62-64 of Waite).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.



TBT

December 25, 2007

THANHNGA TRUONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER